

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the single outstanding ground of rejection is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the remarks which follow.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Anderson et al. (the '485 patent).

In reading the application claims in the disclosure in the '485 patent, the Examiner apparently considers component 32 of the reference as the claimed air duct.

In the first instance, "body (32)" in the '485 patent is not an air duct. Rather, component 32 is in fact the base upon which the enclosure 31 and all of its gas turbine engine components are supported. Admittedly, the base 32 incorporates a duct 57 that receives air from the fan 56 at one end of the duct, and delivers the air through a heat exchange 61 in the compartment housing the engine 33 from which the cooling air is exhausted via louvers 50 (see Figure 40).

In terms of amended independent claim 1, the duct 57 of the '485 patent is not positionable adjacent an air inlet on the container to define, in combination with the container, a first duct inlet opening. In this regard, the '485 patent expressly indicates that cooling air is drawn in from the left-hand end of the generator 34 as viewed in Figures 1 and 4 through an opening which is not shown in the drawings. In fact, there is nothing in the '485 patent that suggests that there is any duct component between the air inlet and the duct 57. Moreover, even if the duct 57 were interpreted to be located adjacent the inlet to the enclosure 31, the second opening of the duct 57 adjacent the heat

exchanger 61 is not at an angle to the first opening adjacent the fan as required by claim 1. Rather, the inlet and outlet openings of the duct 57 lie in the same plane. Thus, it is clear that the subject matter of independent claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the disclosure in the '485 patent.

Additional limitations contained in dependent claims 4-9 are also neither disclosed nor suggested in the applied reference.

Independent claim 10 is directed toward a portable power module that includes a container having an air inlet; a motor and a generator positioned within the container and an air duct as defined in independent claim 1. Changes similar to those made in independent claim 1 have also been made to independent claim 10 and for the same reasons, the subject matter of claim 10 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the '485 patent.

Various of the claims dependent on claim 10 contain similar limitations to those discussed above in connection with independent claim 1 and are also neither disclosed nor rendered obvious by the reference.

Further in this regard, the additional recitation in dependent claims 17-26 relating to the overall structure of the portable power module are clearly not disclosed or suggested in the applied reference.

Independent claim 27 as amended relates to a method for providing ambient air to a portable power module and among the manipulative steps recited, an air duct is defined in terms similar to those utilized in amended claims 1 and 10. For essentially the same

reasons, independent claim 27 and dependent claims 28-32 are also nowhere disclosed or suggested in the applied prior art.

Should the Examiner continue to reject any of the application claims, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner expressly point out the specific elements/components of the prior art relied upon.

The application is now in condition for immediate allowance, and early passage to issue is requested. In the event, however, any small matters remain outstanding, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned so that the prosecution of this application can be expeditiously concluded.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:



Michael J. Keenan  
Reg. No. 32,106

MJK:ljb  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100